

The Sun.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 3, 1880.

Special Advertising Notice.
Advertisement Rates.
 Broadway Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Chicago Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Fifth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Fourth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Sixth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Seventh Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Eighth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Ninth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Tenth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Eleventh Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Twelfth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Thirteenth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Fourteenth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Fifteenth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Sixteenth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Seventeenth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Eighteenth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Nineteenth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.
 Twentieth Avenue Office: The Sun, 100 Broadway, N. Y.

Mr. Seymour and the Presidency.

One of our Washington correspondents says there is a growing impression that HONORABLE SEYMOUR is really a candidate for the Presidency.

There may be something in this. We have more confidence in his ability to make a masterly speech on butter, cheese, and freights than we have in the indestructibility of his resolution to decline running for President.

What purported to be an interview with Mr. SEYMOUR was recently reported by one of our esteemed contemporaries. In this interview Mr. SEYMOUR appeared to give the following answers to the questions put to him by the reporter: "The chief thing that we need to do is to get on with the work, and while the entire press of the country now treats him with courtesy, he was aware that a torrent of abuse would begin to descend upon him as soon as he should become a candidate."

Mr. SEYMOUR is right about this. The fact of his addressing the mob in New York at the time of the riot as "My friends"—though probably having in fact no significance beyond a desire to gain their attention—would be placed all over the country as proof that Gov. SEYMOUR, at heart, was in sympathy with the rebels.

Mr. SEYMOUR ranks to-day as the most scholarly, the most comprehensive, the most finished of living American orators, on special occasions. He has grown much, and is a far greater man than when he was Governor of this State. So long as he remains on the retired list even Republicans delight to praise him. But we believe SEYMOUR E. CHURCH would be a stronger candidate for President.

Why Grant Cannot Be Elected.

It is not the long heads of the Republican party who are working to nominate GRANT for a third term. It is the short-legged tail weights who are engineering the GRANT enterprise.

A look at the facts demonstrates this. No sober man believes that GRANT could get even one of the 138 electoral votes of the Southern States. The time is coming when the Southern vote will be divided among different political parties; but this will not be the case at the next election. In that contest a Democratic candidate who can unite the full strength of his party is absolutely sure of receiving these 138 Southern votes. Grant would lose.

The hope of success for the Republicans in the next year's campaign, therefore, rests wholly in the Northern States. These States give 221 electoral votes. The majority which is necessary to elect a President is 155. It will be seen that the Northern States cast forty-six more than this number. Hence, the Republican nominee for President might lose forty-six votes in the Northern States and still be elected.

Now, let the GRANT managers look at the figures. New York gives thirty-five votes, Ohio twenty-two, and Wisconsin ten, making a total of sixty-seven. GRANT could not carry either of those States against a Democratic nominee upon whom the party was united. In New York GRANT would run no better than CORNELL at the recent election. If the Democracy had been united on their candidate for Governor, CORNELL would have been beaten by a plurality of 50,000.

For a dozen years past the Germans have decided every contested election in Ohio. The German vote in that State is larger than it is in any other State in the Union. At the West, everywhere, accepts the apothegm, "As good as German, so good as dead." The Germans everywhere are indirectly hostile to the third term project. They see in it the shadow of the Empire. If GRANT is the candidate next year, the German Republicans will take from him the twenty-two votes of Ohio.

Substantially the same is true of Wisconsin. The Republicans of that State have always been in debt to heavy German vote for their victories. With a Democratic nominee upon whom all factions of the party were cordially combined, and with GRANT as the Republican candidate, the Germans would throw their votes of Wisconsin into the Democratic scale.

In the light of these facts and figures, the sober majority of the Republican party ought to rise up and crush the third term movement before it crushes them.

The News from Cairo.

For the present, it appears that history will not repeat itself in the sense of a second attempt to occupy Afghanistan. The catastrophe which seemed to threaten the force under Gen. ROBERTS with the fate of ELPHINSTONE's army has, for the time at least, been averted, and many circumstances indicate that the British control of the capital will now remain in the hands of the winter. In that case, a permanent conquest of the country during the coming summer should encounter no insuperable obstacles, seeing that, railways, in winter, are completed to the very edge of the hills, both on the Khyber and Bolan sides. The events of the past week demonstrate that the fundamental cause of the difference in the results of the recent Afghan uprising, as compared with the outbreak in 1841, may be found in the greater proximity of the British base of supplies at Kandahar to their expeditionary force.

Undoubtedly, the British will be inclined to the generalship of the British commander. The removal of his troops from the half-ruined citadel of Bala Hissar, and from the narrow, intricate streets of an Oriental town, where the movement of artillery would be impracticable, to a fortified camp outside the walls, must be recognized as a piece of far-sighted strategy. It was content to bear the odium of an apparent expulsion from the capital, knowing that the town could be retaken at any moment after he had shown his ability to cope with the Afghan soldiers on the heights. Report has probably at first exaggerated the numbers of the latter, but we are of the opinion that the British commander, by means of his superior strategy, has not only averted disaster, but has also secured a permanent conquest of the country.

Why should the taxpayers be charged more than a million a year to keep up this splendid imitation of a foreign system? Why should ignorant politicians, without means or good breeding, be maintained at the public expense, for misrepresenting the intelligence, worth, and refinement of the great body of the American people? The managers of both parties, who want these places as political pensions for their friends, are the cause of it.

Why should the taxpayers be charged more than a million a year to keep up this splendid imitation of a foreign system? Why should ignorant politicians, without means or good breeding, be maintained at the public expense, for misrepresenting the intelligence, worth, and refinement of the great body of the American people? The managers of both parties, who want these places as political pensions for their friends, are the cause of it.

proved so fatal to ELPHINSTONE, and succeeded in joining the beleaguered troops on the morning of Dec. 24. The previous day, however, had been selected by MAHMOUD JAN and his fellow leaders for a desperate attempt to overwhelm the troops in the Shirpur entrenchments before the reinforcements could come up. The total misdirection of this attempt bears striking witness to the skill and firmness of the British commander. No sooner, we are told, was the enemy's purpose fully developed, than a counter attack with cavalry and artillery was organized and successfully carried out. As the result of the fighting, which seems to have continued all day, the heights commanding the road from India were occupied by the English outposts, the Afghan army was broken up, and Cabul was evacuated by MAHMOUD JAN and his followers, who dispersed in various directions, pursued or allowed to retreat. That the fighting must have been severe is proved by the admitted loss of 77 killed and 220 wounded on the part of Gen. ROBERTS.

That the country about Cabul and the line of communication with India are now clear, seems to be attested by the telegram that on Dec. 27 a column would start northward for Kohistan to punish the natives of that district for their prominent share in the late outbreak. Such a movement indicates not only absolute confidence on the part of the English General to maintain henceforward their grasp upon the capital. When we consider that throughout the recent disturbances Gens. TYLDER and STEWART have firmly held their ground at Candahar and kept open the Bolan Pass, we must concede that the storm has been well weathered, and that the success of a concerted movement upon Herat with the opening of spring is extremely probable. Nor would it be surprising to see Herat acquired without a blow, through the ready complicity of the Afghan chiefs, who know that the outbreak has elapsed, will be sure to quarrel among themselves.

While the English Generals in the Cabul district seem to have committed no strategic error subsequent to Gen. MASSY's grave blunder, it must be owned that the Afghans were far from evincing the same measure of unity and daring as in 1841. They seem to have deserted their assault upon the Shirpur entrenchments in the faith that the hill tribes would rise along the whole line of the Khyber Pass, and thus demoralize the beleaguered troops by cutting off all hope of reinforcement. It was by just such isolation that the fathers of the movement who followed MAHMOUD JAN had forced ELPHINSTONE to capitulate, and they might naturally expect that a campaign so curiously analogous in its initial features would have a similar ending. To the fanatics of Cabul it may well have seemed incredible that such warlike clans as the Afghans and the Mommads would let slip the opportunity of wiping out the infidel.

The mountaineers of the Khyber were in a position, however, to know more about the infidel than were the Afghans. They could see that the conditions of the war were essentially different in 1841 and now. They knew that the British frontier had been pressed hundreds of miles nearer to the Afghan capital; that it now fringed the very edge of the Solymian range; that, by the railroad prolonged from Peshawar, endless relays of men and of supplies could be set down at an hour's notice almost in the jaws of their death. Their reluctance to enter upon a struggle which, in the changed condition of affairs, must be a long and fierce one, would be augmented by an uncertainty as to the lavish subsidies which the Indian Government has promised that has been publicly claimed for him, and who cut down to narrower limits his possibilities of accomplishment, are at least entitled to the merit of speaking in time. Whether they are right or wrong, their course is bolder than that of experts who keep discreetly quiet in order to see "what I can get out of it." After the actual measure of Edson's achievement becomes definitely known.

Pittsburgh's iron workers are happy over the discovery that the iron mill in that region is all but lost. The conditions of the war are all they can desire. Has the prosperity come to stay? is their new question.

Prosecutor COWENHUGH of Middlesex county, detained to be held in his fellow prosecutor in New Jersey in doing his duty. He resisted the attempt made to send ex-Coroner LITTON, an influential politician, from going to the State prison for embezzlement, and Judge SCUDDER and the associate Judges did their part by making the sentence \$500 fine and two years imprisonment. The case of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year of his five-year term. His case hangs upon the Supreme Court's decision as to whether the act of 1878, under which the act was passed, the court could look back five years through the accounts of LITTON's father-in-law, HART MOORE, was his predecessor in office, and has been proved to be guilty of defalcation in almost every year